

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned Office action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-7, were rejected under Section 102(b) over *Rimhagen*.

Responsive to the rejection of the claims, the claims have been amended in manners, as set forth herein, believed better to distinguish the present invention over the cited reference. Namely, independent claims 1 and 5, and dependent claims 3-4 have been amended. Dependent claim 2 has been deleted.

Support for the amendments can be found, e.g., in paragraph 31 of the specification, and in Figure 5a.

With respect to claim 1, the claim has been amended, now to recite the operation of causing the user equipment to read a master information block of the broadcast system information when the user equipment has configured a Paging Channel (PCH) or Forward Access Channel (FACH) after cell reselection. By reading the master information block, the user equipment is able to ascertain whether or not there has been a change in system information, regardless of whether a message indicating such a change in the system information has been received by the user equipment device.

Although *Rimhagen* appears to contemplate a device moving between cells, the reference fails to address the specific problem that notifications of change in the system information may be missed by a mobile device if it is reconfiguring in some states. *Rimhagen*, instead, indicates that after a device has changed cells, it will pick up any changes in a system information block (SIB) according to the checking schedule rather than upon reconfiguration. Claim 1, as now amended, is therefore believed to be distinguishable over *Rimhagen*.

Independent claims 5-7, which recite apparatus and a computer program product, respectively, include analogous recitations and are believed to be distinguishable over *Rimhagen* for the same reasons as those just-given with respect to claim 1.

As the remaining dependent claims include all the limitations of their parent claim, these claims are believed also to be patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for the same reasons as those given with respect to claim 1.

Appl. No. 10/754,735
Amdt. dated July 19, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 20, 2006

In light of the foregoing, claims 1-7, as now amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, re-examination and reconsideration for allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

Dated: _____

Robert H. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com